



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,449	03/26/2001	Scott Trees	P1577USA	9117

7590 11/22/2002

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER
CITICORP CENTER
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3800
CHICAGO, IL 60661-2511

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MCCORMICK, SUSAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1661	11

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/817,449	TREES, SCOTT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Susan B. McCormick	1661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 4-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 August 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i> . |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Petition granted for 37 CFR 1.184.

Detailed Action

Drawings

Applicant has submitted a petition to accept color drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 filed August 20, 2002 in paper no. 7. The petition decision is attached to this Office action.

Duplicate Claims

Applicant is advised that should claim 5 be found allowable, claim 12 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on August 20, 2002 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of March 21, 2002 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 21, 2002, was filed after the mailing date of the Office action on May 21, 2002. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically:

Claim 12 appears to have a grammatical error in the word "claims" which should be --claim--.

Written Description

Claims 4, 6-10, 11, 13-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant argues the specification adequately describes how to produce the interspecific *Lobelia* plant and provides sufficient written description for one skilled in the art to make or/use the invention. This argument is not persuasive because it is directed to the issue of enablement, which is not the basis of the rejection. The issue at hand is whether Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. In analyzing whether the written description requirement is met for genus claims, it is determined whether a representative number of species have been described. In this case, the one disclosed embodiment is not representative of the enormous number of products claimed. *Lobelias* can vary widely in flower morphology, flower color, leaf morphology, pest resistance and many other characteristics. Since these traits vary independently, the claims encompass millions of plants having unique combinations of phenotypic characteristics. The specification only provides a complete description of 'BFP-100'. Therefore, Applicants are not in possession of the claimed genus.

Enablement

Claims 5-10 and 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The skilled artisan would not know how to make the claimed plants because the specification does not teach a reproducible method of making BFP-100 because, due to the random nature of gene segregation during sexual reproduction, the odds against reproducing BFP-100 from the disclosed starting materials are astronomical.

Applicant wishes to hold a deposit of seed in abeyance. To clarify the Office's position, the Office did not require a deposit of **seed** (emphasis added) because it does not appear that BFP-100 is a plant line which breeds true from seed. If there is a written assurance that an acceptable deposit will be

Art Unit: 1661

made the claims can be allowed (see MPEP 2411-03), but Applicant has not indicated what they intend to deposit, so the Office cannot tell if it is "acceptable."

Conclusion

Claims 1-3 are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Susan B. McCormick whose telephone number is (703) 305-1682. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (703) 308-4205. The fax number for the group is (703) 305-3014 or 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Matrix Customer Service Center whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600